



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/772,476

02/05/2004

Michael K. Brown

13210-140

4975

1059

7590

08/19/2008

BERESKIN AND PARR
40 KING STREET WEST
BOX 401
TORONTO, ON M5H 3Y2
CANADA

EXAMINER

LAI, MICHAEL C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2157

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/19/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/772,476	Applicant(s) BROWN ET AL.	
	Examiner MICHAEL C. LAI	Art Unit 2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-14,23,27-36,45 and 46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-14,23,27-36,45 and 46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/8/2008, 5/22/2008</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to communication filed on 05/08/2008.

Claims 1, 5-14, 23, 27-36, and 45-46 have been examined.

Response to Amendment

2. The examiner has acknowledged the amended claims 1, 23, 45, and cancelled claims 2-4, 15-22, 24-26, 37-44. Claims 1, 5-14, 23, 27-36, and 45-46 are pending.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 5/8/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument, see page 9, with respect to "None of the servers that may be considered to be a "proxy" in Kasai perform a conversion from text, sent from a mobile computer device, into HTML format before the processing server (e.g. a translation server) further processes the message (e.g. performs the translation). The various "proxy servers" disclosed in Kasai perform different functions and work in a different way as compared to the Applicants' claimed proxy. For example, Kasai's proxy server 9 relays web page requests and web page downloads between a WWW browser 7 and a browser 6 on a client device 5 (see e.g. Kasai, col. 5 lines 22-31). As a further example, Kasai's proxy server 2a functions as a translated text cache server, to search for translation results retained in a cache (see e.g. Kasai, col. 8 lines 27-36). None of Kasai's proxy

servers are configured to perform the same acts as required by the proxy recited in the Applicants' amended independent claims", is not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments, the proxy server (32) and the translation server (33) forming part of the server system (1) in Kasai's fourth embodiment are equivalent to the proxy (22) and the processing server (24) being part of the server (20) as defined in the instant application. The proxy server (32) actually does some sort of format conversion for the translation server (33) when extracting text from an email in Kasai's fourth embodiment (see column 21, lines 42-49).

Applicant's argument, see page 9, with respect to "However, in obtaining a translation, Kasai does not disclose that the WWW server or any other server performs an intermediate act of converting text received from a mobile device into HTML for use as input to a translation server", is not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments, it is known to a person skilled in the art that emails can be sent in several formats including HTML. And because of the high versatility of HTML, a person skilled in the art would certainly consider this language to solve the problem of translation of emails using different formats in Kasai's fourth embodiment. The use of HTML is therefore considered as an obvious choice of options to a person skilled in the art. Kasai's fifth embodiment further discloses that the data accept module 42 of the server performs format conversion for messages received from the client device before sending to the translation processing module 43 for translation (see Kasai FIG. 18 and col. 22

line 22 through col. 23 line 67). In view of such, Kasai does teach “performing an intermediate act of converting text received from a mobile device into HTML for use as input to a translation server”.

In view of the foregoing, it is obvious that the reference to Kasai clearly provides for the claimed limitation of “wherein the at least one server comprises a proxy and a processing server; wherein the representation of the initial message is sent first to the proxy for conversion from a text format into a new format compatible with the processing server before sending the initial message in the new format to the processing server, the new format being hypertext markup language.”

Thus, in view of such, the rejection is sustained as follows:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 5-14, 23, 27-36, and 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kasai et al. (US 7,216,072 B2, hereinafter Kasai).

Regarding claim 1, Kasai discloses a method of converting an initial message residing in a mobile computer device capable of wireless access [FIG. 17 and col. 11, lines 22-25, handheld terminal or cellular phone] to a computer network into a processed message, the method comprising:

presenting a menu option to a user of the device for converting the initial message into the processed message, wherein program instructions for presenting the menu option originate in the mobile computer device [FIG. 3, col. 5, lines 63-66; FIG. 17 and col. 21, lines 22-26];

after the user selects the menu option to convert, sending a representation of the initial message to at least one server on the computer network for converting the representation of the initial message into the processed message [col. 6, lines 2-5, request message; col. 21, lines 33-39];

wherein the at least one server comprises a proxy and a processing server [FIG. 17, col. 21, lines 42-49. Note that the proxy server (32) and the translation server (33) forming part of the server system (1) in Kasai's reference are equivalent to the proxy (22) and the processing server (24) in the claim];

wherein the representation of the initial message is sent first to the proxy for conversion from a text format into a new format compatible with the processing server before sending the initial message in the new format to the processing server, and then to the processing server [col. 16, lines 5-14; FIG. 17, col. 21, lines 42-49; Note that the proxy server (32) actually does some sort of format conversion for the translation server (33) when extracting text from an email]; and

the mobile computer device receiving a representation of the processed message from a particular one of the at least one server [col. 6, lines 2-5, response message; col. 21, lines 54-56].

Kasai discloses all limitations of claim 1, except the new format being hypertext markup language. However, it is known to a person skilled in the art that emails can be sent in several formats including HTML. And because of the high versatility of HTML, a person skilled in the art would certainly consider this language to solve the problem of translation of emails using different formats in Kasai's fourth embodiment. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to convert from a text format into HTML before sending the message to the processing server as a choice of options, thereby solving the problem of translation of emails using different formats.

Regarding claim 5, Kasai discloses the method of claim 1, wherein, in the step of receiving, the representation of the processed message is received by the mobile computer device via a proxy in the computer network [Kasai, FIG. 1].

Regarding claim 6, Kasai discloses the method of claim 5, wherein the proxy converts the processed message into a device-formatted representation of the processed message before sending to the mobile computer device [Kasai, col. 6, lines 6-9, the WWW server uses HTML implying the proxy converts the message into a device-formatted message before sending it to the mobile device].

Regarding claim 7, Kasai discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the menu option is a translation option, an encryption option, a spell check option or a thesaurus option [Kasai, FIG. 3 and col. 7, lines 17-21, translation option].

Regarding claim 8, Kasai discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the initial message is text displayed on the mobile computer device in a first language [Kasai, FIG. 3].

Regarding claim 9, Kasai discloses the method of claim 8, wherein the text forms part of an email [Kasai, FIG. 9 and col. 14, lines 19-34].

Regarding claim 10, Kasai discloses the method of claim 8, wherein the text is in a Web page [Kasai, FIG. 1, browser on the device and the WWW server uses HTML].

Regarding claim 11, Kasai discloses the method of claim 8, wherein the menu option is a translation option, such that when the translation option is selected, a pop-up is displayed prompting a user of the mobile computer device to choose at least one translation characteristic option [Kasai, FIG. 3 and col. 6-7, lines 59-26].

Regarding claim 12, Kasai discloses the method of claim 11, wherein the pop-up prompts the user to identify the first language [Kasai, FIG. 3 and col. 6-7, lines 59-26].

Regarding claim 13, Kasai discloses the method of claim 11, wherein the pop-up prompts the user to choose a second language into which the text is to be translated [Kasai, FIG. 3 and col. 7, lines 22-26].

Regarding claim 14, Kasai discloses the method of claim 1, but silent about further comprising, before the step of presenting, automatically checking to determine whether the initial message corresponds to text in a language that is not native to a user of the mobile computer device. Official Notice is taken for checking the initial message to see if the text is in a language that is not native to the user, as this is essential for determining if a translation is needed. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to do so for the purpose of avoiding unnecessary operation by determining if a translation is needed before presenting the menu to the user, thereby providing a more efficient translation system.

Claims 23, 27-36 are of the same scope as claims 1, 5-14. They are rejected for the same reason as for claims 1, 5-14 respectively.

Claim 45 is of the same scope as claim 1. It is rejected for the same reason as for claim 1.

Regarding claim 46, Kasai discloses the computer-readable medium of claim 45, wherein the initial message is in a first language, and the processed message is in a translated language [Kasai, col. 6, lines 2-5, request/response messages].

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and the objection made. Applicant must show how the amendments avoid such references and objections. See 37 CFR 1.111(c).
7. Hokao, US 6,907,256 B2, has taught a mobile terminal with an automatic translation function.
8. Hayashi Hiroto, JP 2001 251429 A, has taught a mobile voice translation system.
9. Fish, WO 02/23389 A1, has taught systems and methods for translating information.

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Lai whose telephone number is (571) 270-3236. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00 EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2157

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael C. Lai
02AUG2008

/Yves Dalencourt/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2157